

Remarks

Claims 1 – 27 are canceled. Claims 28 – 43 are pending.

Claims 36 – 43 stand rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 36 has been amended to recite a memory, and to recite a communications interface application stored in the memory. Claims 36 – 43 are believed to meet the requirements of 35 USC 101.

Claims 28 – 34 and 36 – 42 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha (US 2004/0117375) in view of Zuberi (US 2003/0204552).

Claim 36 has been amended to recite a computerized device including a communications interface, the communications interface comprising a processor within the communications interface, and additional limitations. Claims 37 – 43 have been amended to recite the computerized device.

Saha describes using direct memory access for performing database operations between two or more machines. The examiner acknowledges Saha does not disclose the context pre-emptible between the first response and a first subsidiary request, and between a subsidiary response and a subsequent subsidiary request to support other access tasks by the channel adapter performing a context switch.

The examiner relies on Zuberi as a secondary reference. The examiner refers to paragraphs 4, 7, 30, 33. Zuberi does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter including the context including a set of channel adapter resources, and the context being pre-emptible between the first response and a first subsidiary request, and between a subsidiary response and a subsequent subsidiary request, to support other access tasks by the channel adapter performing a context switch.

Although Zuberi does describe context switching, the context switching in Zuberi is entirely different than in the claimed invention. Claim 28, for example, recites, among other limitations, assigning a context including a set of channel adapter resources, and wherein the context is pre-emptible between the first response and a first subsidiary request, and between a subsidiary response and a subsequent subsidiary request. Note, the assigned context includes a set of channel adapter resources. The "context" in Zuberi does not include "a set of channel adapter resources." The "context" in Zuberi refers to the system processor or system processors.

This distinction is further clarified in claim 36, which recites a computerized device including a communications interface, a processor within the communications interface, the processor executes logic by performing the operations, including assigning a context including a set of channel adapter resources. Note, the recited processor is within the communications interface of the computerized device, as opposed to being the system processor of the computerized device.

As explained above, although Zuberi describes context switching, the "context" in Zuberi is for the system processor, and there is no teaching of a "context including a set of channel adapter resources" as recited by the claims.

Paragraph 4 describes the system area network (SAN) adapter. Paragraph 7 describes polling with a dedicated thread. The dedicated thread and application threads will constantly context switch. This context switching refers to the processor, and does not refer to the SAN adapter. That is, there is no discussion of a "context including a set of channel adapter resources" only context switching between the dedicated thread and application threads by the system processor.

Paragraph 30 again describes the operating system context switching from the dedicated thread to one of the application threads. Again, these context switches involve the operating system in the main processor. There is no discussion of a "context including a set of channel adapter resources" as claimed.

Paragraph 33 describes content switching by the operating system between the dedicated thread and application threads. There is no discussion of a "context including a set of channel adapter resources" as claimed.

For reasons given above, claims 28 – 34 and 36 – 42 are believed to be patentable.

Claims 35 and 43 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha and Zuberi further in view of Turner (An approach for congestion control in Infiniband). Claims 35 and 43 are dependent claims and are also believed to be patentable.

All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,
PAZHANI PILLAI et al.

By: /Jeremy J. Curcuri/
Jeremy J. Curcuri
Reg. No. 42,454
Attorney for Applicant

Date: September 2, 2011

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351